Generalized spin squeezing inequalities for particles number with quantum fluctuations

I. Saideh*
Univ Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, MPQ, UMR 7162 CNRS, F-75205 Paris, France and Institut des Sciences Moléculaires d'Orsay, Bâtiment 350, UMR8214, CNRS-Université Paris-Sud, Université Paris-Saclay 91405 Orsay, France

S. Felicetti, T. Coudreau, and P. Milman
Univ Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, MPQ, UMR 7162 CNRS, F-75205 Paris, France

Arne Keller
Institut des Sciences Moléculaires d'Orsay, Bâtiment 350, UMR8214, CNRS-Université Paris-Sud, Université Paris-Saclay 91405 Orsay, France

arXiv:1606.08801v1 [quant-ph] 28 Jun 2016

Particle number fluctuations, no matter how small, are present in experimental set-ups. One should rigorously take these fluctuations into account, especially, for entanglement detection. In this context, we generalize the spin squeezing inequalities introduced by Tóth et al. in Ref.[1]. These new inequalities are fulfilled by all separable states even when the number of particle is not constant, and may present quantum fluctuations. These inequalities are useful for detecting entanglement in many-body systems when the super-selection rule does not apply, or when only a subspace of the total systems Hilbert space is considered. We also define general dichotomic observables for which we obtain a coordinate independent form of the generalized spin squeezing inequalities. We give an example where our generalized coordinate independent spin squeezing inequalities present a clear advantage over the original ones.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the quest for quantum computers and quantum simulators, the ability to create, detect and characterize large scale entanglement in many body systems is one of the key point that has attracted a lot of interest in the last decade [2–4]. From a more fundamental perspective, the understanding of the entanglement properties and their manipulation at the macroscopic level is also of importance to understand the quantum to classical transition [5, 6]. It is worth noticing that due to the exponential growth of the Hilbert space dimension with the number of parties N, an exact numerical simulation of such systems with classical computer is not possible when N becomes of the order of some tens. In this context, providing theoretical tools for the experimental detection of entanglement is a necessity. Typically, such experiments involve interacting many body systems as cold atoms [4, 7], trapped ions [8–10] or photons [11, 12], and individual addressing or accessing each body individually is not possible. Accessible observables consist more often of collectives ones, expressed as the sum of local observables that in most cases are one body operators. The spatial component of a collective spin, sum of local spins, is such an instance of a global observable. If the global spin state is squeezed, that is, if the fluctuation of one of its component is sufficiently small compared to the expectation of the other components, then it can be shown that the N-spin systems is entangled [13, 14]. Tóth and collaborators [1, 15–17] have generalized such an approach providing a set of inequalities that are fulfilled for all separable state of the N spins system and thus are able to detect entanglement when violated.

The original spin-squeezing inequalities [1, 15, 16] consider the number of particles N as a constant. In fact, N may undergo classical and/or quantum fluctuations. Classical fluctuations are due the presence of statistical mixtures of states with different N. In contrast, quantum fluctuations are given by coherent superposition of states corresponding to different number of particles. It is often argued, in the context of Bose-Einstein condensation [18], that coherent superposition of states corresponding to different number of particles are not allowed or can not give observable consequences. The proscription of such coherent superposition is often justified by an axiomatic superselection rule (SSR) which should be applied to massive particles but not to massless ones. Actually, this SSR is a consequence of the lack of a fixed absolute phase reference [19]. It has been pointed-out that such phase reference can be established allowing for instance the coherent quantum superposition of an atom and a molecule [20]. Quantum and classical particles number fluctuations have been considered in the context of quantum metrology [21], where the relation of quantum-enhanced parameter estimation and entanglement is investigated when the particles number is only known on average. Spin squeezing inequalities for fluctuating N have been considered in Ref [22] but the fluctuations of the total number of particles considered in that work were only classical (statistical) fluctuations and quantum fluctuations were not investigated.

In this work we generalize the original spin squeezing

* ibrahim.saideh@u-psud.fr

inequality of Ref. [17], by considering the situation of arbitrary particle number fluctuations, including quantum and/or classical ones. This generalization is important and necessary in many experimental situations even where the SSR applies. Such an interesting example can be found in Ref. [4] where a system of N spin 1 is considered as a systems of N spin-1/2 by projecting each spin 1 on the subspace spanned by two magnetic sub-levels. In this subspace, quantum fluctuations (and not only statistical ones) of the particle number are expected, and the validity of the original spin squeezing inequalities is not granted.

This paper is organized as follows. Our main results are presented without proof in section II. In section III, a sketch of the proof of our inequalities is presented, leaving the technicality to appendices. In section IV, we consider the special but important case where the 3 measured observables are dichotomic observables, that is observables with only 2 different eigenvalues, as the spin-1/2 component operators. For this particular case, we show that our inequalities can be put in a coordinate system independent form. In section V, our inequalities are compared to the original ones [1, 17] in two different cases. In the first example given in section V, we show that it is incorrect, in general, to replace N by its expectation value in spin squeezing inequalities, and that our inequalities should be used instead. In the next example, we study numerically entanglement of N spin 1 state. We find that, when restricting to a subspace, our inequalities show a clear advantage over spin squeezing inequalities [16, 17] for N spin 1 particles.

II. MAIN RESULTS

We first recall the original spin inequalities [17], and how they can be generalized using 3 collective operators A_1, A_2 and A_3, instead of the 3 components J_x, J_y and J_z of a collective spin. Finally, we present our new inequalities where particle number fluctuations are considered.

A. Original spin squeezing inequalities

For the sake of completeness, we start by recalling the original inequalities derived in Ref. [17] that are fulfilled by all separable states:

$$\tilde{\Delta}^2 J_x + \tilde{\Delta}^2 J_y + \tilde{\Delta}^2 J_z \geq -Nj^2 \tag{1a}$$

$$(N-1)\left[\tilde{\Delta}^2 J_k + \tilde{\Delta}^2 J_l\right] \geq \langle \tilde{J}_m^2 \rangle - N(N-1)j^2 \tag{1b}$$

$$\langle \tilde{J}_l^2 + \tilde{J}_m^2 \rangle - N(N-1)j^2 \leq (N-1)\tilde{\Delta}^2 J_k \tag{1c}$$

$$\langle \tilde{J}_x^2 + \tilde{J}_y^2 + \tilde{J}_z^2 \rangle \leq N(N-1)j^2, \tag{1d}$$

where l, m end k refer to different x, y or z component of the total spin operator $J_l = \sum_{i=1}^N J_l^{(i)}$, sum of the local spins operators $J_l^{(i)} = \bigotimes_{i'=1; i\neq i'}^N \mathbb{1}^{(i')} \otimes j_k^{(i)}$, where $\mathbb{1}^{(i')}$ denotes the identity operator and $j_k^{(i)}$ the k component of the spin in the one particle Hilbert space. The eigenvalues of $(\vec{j}^{(i)})^2$ are $j(j+1)$. As in Ref. [17], the notation $\tilde{J}_k^2$ means :

$$\tilde{J}_k^2 = J_k^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N (J_k^{(i)})^2 = \sum_{i\neq j=1}^N J_k^{(i)} J_k^{(j)} \tag{2}$$

and the modified variance is defined as $\tilde{\Delta}^2 J_k = \langle \tilde{J}_k^2 \rangle - \langle J_k \rangle^2$. The 4 inequalities Eqs. (1) can be written in the following compact form [16]:

$$(N-1)\sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}^2 J_k - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \tilde{J}_k^2 \rangle \geq -N(N-1)j^2, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ can be any subset of $\{x, y, z\}$ (including the empty set). Each inequality in Eqs. (1) is obtained by increasing the number of elements in $\mathcal{I}$ by one, starting from the empty set.

As it has been shown in Ref. [16], the vectorial character of the spin is not needed to obtain Eq. (3). Indeed, a set of 3 collective observables A_k where $k = 1, 2, 3$ can be used instead, each of them obtained as a sum of local observable as $A_k = \sum_{i=1}^N A_k^{(i)}$. To be able to derive inequalities as Eq. (3), it is only required that

$$\sum_{k=1}^3 \langle A_k^{(i)} \rangle^2 \leq \alpha^2; \forall i = 1, 2, \cdots, N, \tag{4}$$

which is satisfied by the spin operators $J_k^{(i)}$ with $\alpha = j$. Then, as it has been shown in Ref. [16], using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\langle A_k \rangle^2 \leq N \sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_k^{(i)} \rangle^2 \tag{5}$$

and the concavity of the variance, we obtain the inequalities (3) where J_k is replaced by A_k, j is replaced by α and where $\mathcal{I}$ is any subset of $\{1, 2, 3\}$, including the empty set.

B. Fluctuations of particles number

Note that Eqs. (3) are derived for a fixed number of particles N. To generalize these equations to include quantum fluctuations of the particle number, we consider that we have N sites ($i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$), and that in each site there is one or zero particles. We define the local positive operator $\hat{N}^{(i)}$ giving the number of particle in site i; it has only two eigenvalues 0 or 1 corresponding to the absence or the presence of a particle. Hence, the collective operator $\hat{N} = \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{N}^{(i)}$ represents the total number of particles. Our main result is that all separable states fulfil the following inequalities:

$$\left(\langle \hat{N} \rangle - 1\right) \sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \tilde{A}_k^2 \rangle \geq -\langle \hat{N} \rangle \left(\langle \hat{N} \rangle - 1\right) \alpha^2 - \delta, \tag{6}$$

where δ is defined as

$$\delta = \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_1 + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_2 + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_3 + \alpha^2 \langle \hat{N} \rangle \tag{7}$$

and corresponds to the term added to Eq. (3) when N is replaced by $\langle \hat{N} \rangle$. That is, setting $\delta = 0$ and replacing $\langle N \rangle$ by the constant N in Eq. (6) give us Eq. (3). These inequalities are very convenient since they are as simple as the original ones. Indeed, to test their violation, the same type of measurements realized in the original inequalities for fixed particle number must be performed. Eq. (6) can also be written explicitly, by increasing the cardinality of $\mathcal{I}$:

$$\tilde{\Delta}^2 A_1 + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_2 + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_3 \geq -\alpha^2 \langle \hat{N} \rangle \tag{8a}$$

$$\left(\langle \hat{N} \rangle - 1\right) \left(\tilde{\Delta}^2 A_i + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_j\right) - \langle \tilde{A}_k^2 \rangle \geq -\alpha^2 \langle \hat{N} \rangle \left(\langle \hat{N} \rangle - 1\right) - \delta \tag{8b}$$

$$\left(\langle \hat{N} \rangle - 1\right) \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_i - \langle \tilde{A}_j^2 \rangle - \langle \tilde{A}_k^2 \rangle \geq -\alpha^2 \langle \hat{N} \rangle \left(\langle \hat{N} \rangle - 1\right) - \delta \tag{8c}$$

$$\langle \tilde{A}_1^2 \rangle + \langle \tilde{A}_2^2 \rangle + \langle \tilde{A}_3^2 \rangle \leq \alpha^2 \langle \hat{N} \rangle \left(\langle \hat{N} \rangle - 1\right) + \delta \tag{8d}$$

We note that the first inequality is exactly the same as Eq. (1a) but with N replaced by $\langle N \rangle$. That is, we can replace N by $\langle N \rangle$ in Eq. (1a) and it remains a valid equation fulfilled by all separable states when N is not a constant. We also note that Eq. (8a) can be written as $\delta \geq 0$.

Now, if in a given experiment δ is found to be positive, then inequalities Eqs. (8b-d) are less tight than the original inequalities Eqs. (1b-d). Hence, a violation of Eqs. (1b-d) can appear without violating Eqs. (8b-d). In other words, The simple substitution of N by $\langle N \rangle$ in the original inequalities Eqs. (1b-d) can give false positive. This is why it is crucial to consider the term δ before to affirming entanglement detection. In the other case, when $\delta < 0$, both inequalities, Eq. (1a) or Eq. (8a), detect entanglement, but Eqs. (8b-d) becomes tighter than than the original ones, Eqs. (1b-d). Hence, in this case, the visibility of the violation is higher, which can represent an important advantage from the experimental point of view.

III. PROOF

We give a sketch of the proof leaving the technical details in appendix A and B. The proof is done in two steps. In the first step, inequalities fulfilled by all product states $\rho = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N} \rho^{(i)}$ are obtained, then in a second step we generalize them to all separable states using convexity arguments.

A. Inequalities for product states

For the first step, the main objective is to obtain a tighter inequality than the one obtained in Eq. (5) through the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. For this, the main idea is to map each local state $\rho^{(i)}$, in the site i, to a spin 1, or a 3-level state $R^{(i)}$ in an auxiliary Hilbert space spanned by $|0^{(i)}\rangle, |1^{(i)}\rangle, |2^{(i)}\rangle$ states as follows :

$$R^{(i)} = n_i \left(\frac{{\sigma_0}^{(i)}}{2} + \frac{\langle A_1^{(i)} \rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i} {\sigma_x}^{(i)} + \frac{\langle A_2^{(i)} \rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i} {\sigma_y}^{(i)} + \frac{\langle A_3^{(i)} \rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i} \sigma_z \right) + (1 - n_i) \, |2^{(i)}\rangle\langle 2^{(i)}| \tag{9}$$

where $\sigma_0 = |0^{(i)}\rangle\langle 0^{(i)}| + |1^{(i)}\rangle\langle 1^{(i)}|$ is the projection operator on the qubit subspace spanned by the state $|0^{(i)}\rangle$ and $|1^{(i)}\rangle$ and $\sigma_k^{(i)} (k = x, y, z)$ are the Pauli matrices in the same subspace. The constant η_i is chosen as $\eta_i = \sqrt{\langle A_1^{(i)} \rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_2^{(i)} \rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_3^{(i)} \rangle_\rho^2}$, such that the term inside the braket in Eq. (9) is a pure state $|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle$. Therefore the state $R^{(i)}$ can also be written as

$$R^{(i)} = n_i |\Psi^{(i)}\rangle\langle\Psi^{(i)}| + (1 - n_i)|2^{(i)}\rangle\langle 2^{(i)}|, \tag{10}$$

where n_i represents the average occupation number of the particle in site i, that is $n_i = \langle N^{(i)} \rangle_\rho$. The mapping $\rho^{(i)} \to R^{(i)}$ can be interpreted in the following way: when there is a particle in site i, we map its state to a pure state $|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle$ such that $\langle \Psi^{(i)} | \sigma_k | \Psi^{(i)} \rangle = \frac{1}{\eta_i} \langle A_k^{(i)} \rangle_\rho$ and when there is no particle we attribute this event to state $|2^{(i)}\rangle$. Averaging over the occupation of the site i gives us the state $R^{(i)}$. Using techniques similar to those developed in Ref. [23] we can prove (see appendix B) that this mapping is completely positive and thus $R^{(i)}$ is indeed a state, that is a positive hermitian operator. Note that $\langle \sigma_x \rangle_{R^{(i)}} = n_i \frac{\langle A_1^{(i)} \rangle_\rho}{\eta_i}$. This relation is not exactly what we need. Indeed, if we sum over all sites i, $\langle \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma^{(i)} \rangle_{R^{(i)}}$ will not be simply related to the expectation of original collective operator $A_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_1^{(i)}$, because the pre-factor $\frac{n_i}{\eta_i}$ depends on the site i. It can be shown (see appendix A) that applying a rotation in the qubit subspace, we can obtain a new state $R^{(i)'}$ such that $\langle \sigma_x \rangle_{R^{(i)'}} = \frac{\langle A_1^{(i)} \rangle_\rho}{\alpha}$, where the factor α does not depends on the site i and is defined as $\alpha^2 = \sup_{\rho^{(i)}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{3} \langle A_k^{(i)} \rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2 \right]$.

Now, we can consider the product state $R' = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N} R^{(i)'}$ in the qutrit Hilbert space, and define collective spin operators: $S_k = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_k$, which verify the commutation relation $[S_k, S_l] = 2i\epsilon_{klm}S_m$. Using the Heisenberg inequality $\frac{1}{4}\left|\langle [A,B]\rangle_{R'}\right|^2 \leq (\Delta A)^2 (\Delta B)^2$ with $A = S_y$ and $B = S_z$, we can write

$$\left|\langle S_x\rangle_{R'}\right|^2 = \left|\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\langle A_1^{(i)}\rangle_\rho}{\alpha}\right|^2 = \frac{\langle A_1\rangle_\rho^2}{\alpha^2} \leq (\Delta S_y)^2 (\Delta S_z)^2 . \tag{11}$$

In that way, we can obtain a tighter inequality for $\langle A_k\rangle_\rho^2$

$$\langle A_k\rangle_\rho^2 \leq \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right) + \alpha^2 \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\langle N\rangle_\rho - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right). \tag{12}$$

Using similar techniques (see appendix A for more details), we obtain general inequalities fulfilled by all product states:

$$(\langle \hat{N}\rangle - 1)\sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \tilde{A}_k^2\rangle \geq -\langle \hat{N}\rangle(\langle \hat{N}\rangle - 1)\alpha^2 - \delta', \tag{13}$$

where δ' is given by

$$\delta' = \alpha^2\langle \hat{N}\rangle - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I};k\notin\mathcal{I}} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle^2 + \langle \hat{N}\rangle \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I};k\notin\mathcal{I}} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle^2 - \alpha^2\langle \hat{N}^{(i)}\rangle^2\right). \tag{14}$$

Eq. (3) is recovered when we replace A_k by J_k and $\langle \hat{N}\rangle$ by N, in this case $\alpha = j$, $\hat{N}^{(i)} = \mathbb{1}^{(i)}$ and $\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I};k\notin\mathcal{I}} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle^2 = j^2$, therefore $\delta' = 0$. The set of inequalities given by Eq. (13) are valid for any product state. The goal now is to generalize them for any separable state which can be written as a convex sum of product states.

B. Generalization to all separable states

The generalization of inequalities given by Eq. (13) to all separable states is not straightforward. To work around this difficulty, we look for an upper bound δ to δ', such that when δ' is replaced by δ in Eq. (13), the resulting inequalities are easily generalized to all separable states by convexity arguments.

In fact, the last term inside the brackets in Eq. (14) is negative, therefore $\delta' \leq \alpha^2\langle \hat{N}\rangle - \sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I};k\notin\mathcal{I}} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle^2$. In addition, from the definition of the modified variance $\tilde{\Delta}^2$ given by Eq. (2), it is not difficult to show that for product states we have

$$\tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho_{\text{prod}}}^2, \quad \rho_{\text{prod}} \text{ a product state.} \tag{15}$$

We thus obtain the following upper bound for δ':

$$\delta' \leq \alpha^2\langle \hat{N}\rangle + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_1 + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_2 + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_3 = \delta, \tag{16}$$

which is the expression for δ, we have given previously in Eq. (7).

Finally, with this new upper bound, Eq. (13) becomes:

$$(\langle \hat{N}\rangle - 1)\sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \tilde{A}_k^2\rangle \geq -\langle \hat{N}\rangle(\langle \hat{N}\rangle - 1)\alpha^2 - \delta. \tag{17}$$

It turns out, that these inequalities which are valid for all product states can be generalized to all separable states by convexity (see appendix A).

IV. COORDINATE SYSTEM INDEPENDENT FORM FOR DICHOTOMIC OBSERVABLES

Due to Heisenberg uncertainty principle, spin squeezing can not be achieved in all directions. The coordinate independent form of the spin squeezing inequalities [1, 17] allows to detect entanglement without knowing a-priori the direction where the squeezing is maximal.

To illustrate this point, let us recall the squeezing Hamiltonian [13] (see Ref. [24] for a review and the references therein):

$$H = \chi J_x^2 = \chi \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} J_x^{(i)} J_x^{(j)} \tag{18}$$

with χ being some coupling constant. The above squeezing Hamiltonian has been very well studied, both theoretically and experimentally, for a system of N spins 1/2 and is called one axis twisting Hamiltonian [13, 24]. The state $|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iJ_x^2\theta/2}\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}|\frac{1}{2}^{(i)}\rangle$, where $\theta = 2\chi t$, is optimally squeezed along the direction lying in the x-y plane making an angle $\phi \approx \frac{1}{2}\arctan\left(N^{-1/3}\right)$ with the x-axis, for large N [13, 24]. This would suggest that in order to better detect the squeezing in such a state, using spin squeezing inequalities (1a-1d)[17], one needs to measure first and second moments of the rotated spin components $J_{x'} = \cos(\phi)J_x + \sin(\phi)J_y$, $J_{y'} = \cos(\phi)J_y - \sin(\phi)J_x$, and $J_{z'} = J_z$. The purpose of coordinate independent spin squeezing inequalities is to precisely optimally detect squeezing without knowing a-priori the optimal direction ϕ.

A. Coordinate system independent form of the spin-squeezing inequalities

In this section we recall the coordinate independent form of spin squeezing inequalities (1a-1d) [17] introduced in [1] for spin-1/2 and in [17] for general spin j.

First, one needs to define the following matrices [17]:

$$C_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\langle J_i J_j + J_j J_i\rangle \tag{19}$$

$$\gamma_{ij} = C_{ij} - \langle J_i\rangle\langle J_j\rangle \tag{20}$$

$$Q_{ij} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\langle J_i^{(k)} J_j^{(k)} + J_j^{(k)} J_i^{(k)}\rangle}{2} - \frac{j(j+1)\delta_{ij}}{3}\right) \tag{21}$$

$$\mathfrak{X} = (N-1)\gamma + C - N^2 Q \tag{22}$$

with δ_{ij} being the Kronecker delta function. Then, the inequalities inequalities (1a-1d) can be written in the following form [17]:

$$\mathrm{tr}\,[\gamma] - Nj \geq 0 \tag{23a}$$

$$(N-1)\mathrm{tr}\,[\gamma] - N(N-1)j + N^2\frac{j(j+1)}{3} - \lambda_{\max}(\mathfrak{X}) \geq 0 \tag{23b}$$

$$-\mathrm{tr}\,[C] + Nj(Nj+1) - N^2\frac{j(j+1)}{3} + \lambda_{\min}(\mathfrak{X}) \geq 0 \tag{23c}$$

$$-\mathrm{tr}\,[C] + Nj(Nj+1) \geq 0 \tag{23d}$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ are the maximum and minimum eigenvalues of A respectively. The key idea for the above inequalities is that $\mathfrak{X}$ is diagonalized via an orthogonal matrix $\mathfrak{O} \in O(3)$, i.e., $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{O}\Lambda\mathfrak{O}^T$ with Λ a diagonal matrix. Hence, diagonalizing $\mathfrak{X}$ is equivalent to applying the following transformation: $\vec{J}' = \mathfrak{O}^T\mathfrak{J}$, $C' = \mathfrak{O}^T C\mathfrak{O}$, $\gamma' = \mathfrak{O}^T\gamma\mathfrak{O}$, and $Q' = \mathfrak{O}^T Q\mathfrak{O}$. Finally, we have $\mathrm{tr}\,[C'] = \mathrm{tr}\,[C]$ and $\mathrm{tr}\,[\gamma'] = \mathrm{tr}\,[\gamma]$ which represents the invariance of the quantities $\langle J_x^2\rangle + \langle J_y^2\rangle + \langle J_z^2\rangle$ and $(\Delta J_x)^2 + (\Delta J_y)^2 + (\Delta J_z)^2$, respectively, under rotations. Comparing the inequalities (23) with (1), one can show that there exists a direction for which some of the inequalities (1) is violated iff the corresponding inequalities (23) are violated [1, 17].

A natural question arises whether we could define our generalized inequalities (8) in a coordinate independent manner to simplify the task of finding operators A_i such that entanglement is detected. It turns out that we are able to define a coordinate independent version inequalities of (8) for a general class of dichotomic operators which we define now.

B. Dichotomic observables

A very important and popular choice of the operators A_i for the inequalities (8) are the dichotomic observables or spin-1/2 like operators. In this case, the Hilbert space of the single particle states is usually restricted to a 2-dimensional subspace of a two levels system. This restriction to a bi-dimensional subspace has been performed in Ref. [4] where a system of N spin-1 is considered as N spin-1/2 particles. The appeal of this choice is due to the fact that most of the entanglement criteria were originally derived for spin 1/2 systems. Notorious examples are CHSH inequalities [25] for the non-locality of a two spins-1/2 state and spin squeezing inequalities for N spin-1/2 [1].

Specifically, for each particle (i), consider only two magnetic levels states $|m_0^{(i)}\rangle$ and $|m_1^{(i)}\rangle$, among all the eigenstates $|m^{(i)}\rangle(|m^{(i)}| \leq j)$ of $j_z^{(i)}$. In the subspace spanned by these two states, we can define the Pauli operators as:

$$\sigma_x^{(i)} = |m_0^{(i)}\rangle\langle m_1^{(i)}| + |m_1^{(i)}\rangle\langle m_0^{(i)}| \tag{24}$$

$$\sigma_y^{(i)} = -i\left(|m_0^{(i)}\rangle\langle m_1^{(i)}| - |m_1^{(i)}\rangle\langle m_0^{(i)}|\right) \tag{25}$$

$$\sigma_z^{(i)} = |m_0^{(i)}\rangle\langle m_0^{(i)}| - |m_1^{(i)}\rangle\langle m_1^{(i)}| \tag{26}$$

and let us call $N^{(i)}$ the projector into this subspace spanned by $|m_0^{(i)}\rangle, |m_1^{(i)}\rangle$, that is:

$$N^{(i)} = |m_0^{(i)}\rangle\langle m_0^{(i)}| + |m_1^{(i)}\rangle\langle m_1^{(i)}|. \tag{27}$$

An elementary calculation shows that for any state $\rho^{(i)}$ acting on the single particle Hilbert space, we have:

$$\langle\sigma_x^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2 + \langle\sigma_y^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2 + \langle\sigma_z^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2 \leq \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2. \tag{28}$$

Since $N^{(i)}$ is a projector, it is positive and has two eigenvalues 0 and 1. Hence, from Eq. (28), if we choose the state $\rho^{(i)}$ to be a pure state in the subspace $|m_0^{(i)}\rangle, |m_1^{(i)}\rangle$, we find that

$$\alpha^2 = \sup_{\rho^{(i)}}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{3}\langle\sigma_k^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2\right] = 1. \tag{29}$$

We now define the collective operators A_i to be:

$$A_i = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\sigma_i^{(k)}. \tag{30}$$

These three collectives observables A_i fulfill all the requirements to write the generalized spin squeezing inequalities (8).

The class of dichtotomic observables (30) can be extended in slightly more general manner. Instead of the two states $|m_0^{(i)}\rangle, |m_1^{(i)}\rangle$, we can consider two orthogonal projectors $P_0^{(i)}$ and $P_1^{(i)}$ such that

$$\mathrm{rank}\left(P_0^{(i)}\right) = \mathrm{rank}\left(P_1^{(i)}\right) = r. \tag{31}$$

Let us define $\mathcal{H}_0^{(i)}$, $\mathcal{H}_1^{(i)}$ to be the range of $P_0^{(i)}$ and $P_1^{(i)}$ respectively. Let $S^{(i)}$ be a linear map from $\mathcal{H}_1^{(i)}$ to $\mathcal{H}_0^{(i)}$ with singular values equal to 1, i.e. it can be written as

$$S^{(i)} = {U^{(i)}}^{\dagger}\mathbb{1}^{(r)}V^{(i)}, \tag{32}$$

with ${U^{(i)}}^{\dagger}U^{(i)} = \mathbb{1}^{(r)}$ and ${V^{(i)}}^{\dagger}V^{(i)} = \mathbb{1}^{(r)}$.

Finally, let us define

$$S_-^{(i)} = P_0^{(i)} S^{(i)} P_1^{(i)}\,,\; S_+^{(i)} = S_-^{(i)\dagger}. \tag{33}$$

Now, we can generalize the operators A_i defined in Eq.(30) by defining the Pauli-like operators for each particle as:

$$\sigma_z^{(i)} = P_0^{(i)} - P_1^{(i)} \tag{34}$$
$$\sigma_x^{(i)} = S_-^{(i)} + S_+^{(i)} \tag{35}$$
$$\sigma_y^{(i)} = -i\left(S_-^{(i)} - S_+^{(i)}\right) \tag{36}$$
$$N^{(i)} = P_0^{(i)} + P_1^{(i)}. \tag{37}$$

With the above definitions, Eqs. (28, 29) are valid. Moreover, the commutation relations $\left[\sigma_i^{(l)}, \sigma_j^{()}\right] = 2i\epsilon_{ijk}\sigma_k^{(l)}$ still hold. Consequently, the operators defined in Eqs.(34) are the generators of SU(2) in the subspace $\mathcal{H}_0^{(i)} \oplus \mathcal{H}_1^{(i)}$, i.e. any rotation can be applied via the unitary $e^{i\vec{A}.\vec{n}\theta}$, for some normalized vector $\vec{n}$ and real θ. In addition, since $\left[\hat{N}, A_i\right] = 0$, $\langle\hat{N}\rangle$ is invariant under such rotations and behaves simply as a scalar as in the usual spin squeezing inequalities. Hence, the additional quantity δ in our inequalities (8), that takes into account the fluctuations in particle number in the subspace of interest, is also invariant under $SU(2)$ transformations. Which allows us to follow the same steps as in [1, 17] to define coordinate system independent inequalities:

$$\delta = \mathrm{tr}\,[\gamma] - \langle\hat{N}\rangle/2 \geq 0 \tag{38a}$$
$$\delta + \left(\langle\hat{N}\rangle - 1\right)\mathrm{tr}\,[\gamma] - \langle\hat{N}\rangle\left(\langle\hat{N}\rangle - 2\right)/2 - \lambda_{\max}(\mathfrak{X}) \geq 0 \tag{38b}$$
$$\delta - \mathrm{tr}\,[C] - \langle\hat{N}\rangle/2 + \lambda_{\min}(\mathfrak{X}) \geq 0 \tag{38c}$$
$$\delta - \mathrm{tr}\,[C] + \langle\hat{N}\rangle\left(\langle\hat{N}\rangle + 2\right)/4 \geq 0, \tag{38d}$$

where we have defined:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2}\langle A_i A_j + A_j A_i\rangle, \\ \gamma_{ij} &= C_{ij} - \langle A_i\rangle\langle A_j\rangle \\ \mathfrak{X} &= (N-1)\gamma + C. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

As expected, comparing our inequalities (38) with the coordinate independent spin squeezing inequalities for $j = 1/2$ in Refs. [1, 17], they are quite similar except for replacing N with $\langle\hat{N}\rangle$ and the additional term δ. Simply replacing N with $\langle\hat{N}\rangle$ is not enough to obtain our inequalities as we will show later.

V. EXAMPLES

In this section we compare, for two specific cases, the standard spin squeezing inequalities where N is replaced by its expectation $\langle N\rangle$ with our new inequalities. The first case illustrates the importance of the term δ in our inequalities. Indeed, we exhibit a separable mixed state that violates the original inequality, showing that the simple replacement of N by $\langle N\rangle$ can lead to false positive. In the second example, we study the detection of entanglement generated by the one axis twisting Hamiltonian (18) for $N = 5$ spin 1 system. We find that, when restricting to a subspace, our inequalities (38) show a clear advantage over spin squeezing inequalities (1). The latter show no violation at all, whereas, one of the inequalities (38) is violated indicating entanglement almost for all times of the evolution of the $N = 5$ spin 1 system.



FIG. 1. (Color online) $\mathfrak{L}$ (42), in solid blue line, and $\mathfrak{G}$ (43), in dashed green line, calculated in the state $\rho(p)$ (40) as a function of p. The highlighted area represents the instances of p for which the inequality $\mathfrak{L}(p) \geq 0$ is violated.

A. Example I

We have shown, that through our special choice of operators A_i given by Eq. (30), our inequalities (8) and (38) can be obtained from spin squeezing inequalities for $j = 1/2$ [1, 17] by replacing N with $\langle\hat{N}\rangle$ and adding δ. In the following, we give a simple example to highlight the importance of the additional term δ. Let us consider the following separable mixed states for $N = 2$ spin $j = 1$:

$$\rho(p) = p\rho' + (1-p)|0^{(1)}\rangle\langle 0^{(1)}| \otimes |0^{(2)}\rangle\langle 0^{(2)}| \quad 0 \leq p \leq 1 \tag{40}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho' = \frac{1}{2}\Big(&|-1^{(1)}\rangle\langle -1^{(1)}| \otimes |-1^{(2)}\rangle\langle -1^{(2)}| \\ &+ |1^{(1)}\rangle\langle 1^{(1)}| \otimes |1^{(2)}\rangle\langle 1^{(2)}|\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

This state is clearly separable for any value of $0 \leq p \leq 1$. Now let us consider the inequality given by Eq. (1b) and let us replace N by $\langle\hat{N}\rangle$ where $\hat{N}$ is defined in Eq. (27) for the subspace $|-1^{(i)}\rangle, |1^{(i)}\rangle$. Then, it takes the following



FIG. 2. (Color online) (a) to (d): left hand side of inequalities $\mathfrak{G}_1$ (38a) to $\mathfrak{G}_4$ (38d), respectively, calculated in the state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$, defined in Eq. (44), as a function of θ for $N = 5$ spin-1 particles. Highlighted region shows the instances of θ for which inequality (38c) is violated.

form: $\mathfrak{L}(p) \geq 0$, where

$$\mathfrak{L}(p) = \left(\langle \hat{N}\rangle_{\rho(p)} - 1\right)\left(\tilde{\Delta}^2 A_x + \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_y\right) - \langle \tilde{A}_z^2\rangle_{\rho(p)} + \frac{1}{4}\langle \hat{N}\rangle_{\rho(p)}\left(\langle \hat{N}\rangle_{\rho(p)} - 1\right) \quad (42)$$

Next, let us consider the correct form, i.e. Eq. (8b): $\mathfrak{G}(p) \geq 0$, where

$$\mathfrak{G}(p) = \mathfrak{L}(p) + \delta(p) \quad (43)$$

In figure Fig. 1, we plot both quantities $\mathfrak{G}(p)$ and $\mathfrak{L}(p)$ as a function of p. Inequality $\mathfrak{L}(p) \geq 0$ is violated for all p, but it is completely wrong to infer that the state is entangled. In contrast, our inequality $\mathfrak{G}(p) = \mathfrak{L}(p) + \delta(p) \geq 0$ is not violated, as expected. This example shows clearly the importance of the additional term δ when the number of particles is not constant.

B. Example II

As an illustrative example, we consider a system of N spin $j = 1$ initialized in the product state $|\psi_0\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}|0^{(i)}\rangle$. Now let us calculate the left hand side of the inequalities (23) for the state

$$|\psi(\theta)\rangle = e^{-iJ_x^2\theta/2}\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}|0^{(i)}\rangle \quad (44)$$

of N spins $j = 1$. Let us call $\mathfrak{F}_1(\theta)$, $\mathfrak{F}_2(\theta)$, $\mathfrak{F}_3(\theta)$, and $\mathfrak{F}_4(\theta)$ to be the left hand side of inequalities (23a-23d) respectively. Numerical calculations show that these quantities are constant and positive. More precisely, one can verify that $\mathfrak{F}_1(\theta) = N$ and $\mathfrak{F}_i(\theta) = N(N-1)$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$, thus, spin squeezing inequalities (23) fail to detect entanglement in the state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$. The constancy of the quantities $\mathfrak{F}_l(\theta)$, with $l = 1, \cdots, 4$, is due to the choice of the initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}|0^{(i)}\rangle$ and the fact we have chosen $j = 1$. Non trivial evolution of the quantities $\mathfrak{F}_l(\theta)$ will occur for different initial states and different integer spin values $j = 2, 3, \cdots$.

However, if we choose different observables than the collective spin components, our generalized inequalities (8) can be violated inferring entanglement of the state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ for some θ. In particular, we will define dichotomic observables in the subspace $|-1^{(i)}\rangle, |1^{(i)}\rangle$, by setting $|m_0^{(i)}\rangle = |-1^{(i)}\rangle$ and $|m_1^{(i)}\rangle = |1^{(i)}\rangle$ in Eqs.(30, 24, 27), so that the N spin-1 particles can be seen as $\langle \hat{N}\rangle$ spin-1/2 particles.

Now, let us call $\mathfrak{G}_i(\theta) : i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ to be the left hand side of inequalities (38a-38d), respectively, calculated for the state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ (44). In Fig. 2, we plot $\mathfrak{G}_i(\theta)$ for $N = 5$, and we can see that $\mathfrak{G}_3(\theta)$ violates the inequality (38c), Fig. 2(c). Consequently, we show that the state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ is entangled, at least, when inequality (38c) is violated.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have generalized the spin squeezing inequalities in order to consider quantum fluctuations of the number of particles N. Our generalized inequalities can be obtained from the original ones by replacing N with its expectation value $\langle N\rangle$ and by adding a new term δ which is not more difficult to measure than the other terms forming the original inequalities. In the case where the measured observables are dichotomic, we have shown that we can define coordinates independent spin squeezing inequalities in the same way it had been defined previously for the original inequalities. The non conservation of the number of particles allows more flexibility in the set of observables to be used to test the inequalities. We have presented an example where such flexibility allows for the detection of an entangled state which was not detected by the original inequalities. We also warn that using the original inequalities, in a context where the number of particles N fluctuates, by replacing N by its expectation value $\langle N\rangle$ can result in a violation for separable states, hence giving false positive.

[1] G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne, and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 250405 (2007).
[2] J. Anders and D. E. Browne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 050502 (2009).
[3] M. Chen, N. C. Menicucci, and O. Pfister, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 120505 (2014).
[4] B. Lücke, J. Peise, G. Vitagliano, J. Arlt, L. Santos, G. Tóth, and C. Klempt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 155304 (2014).
[5] P. Milman, W. Maineult, S. Guibal, L. Guidoni, B. Douçot, L. Ioffe, and T. Coudreau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 020503 (2007).
[6] L. Aolita, R. Chaves, D. Cavalcanti, A. Acín, and L. Davidovich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 080501 (2008).
[7] J. Meineke, J.-P. Brantut, D. Stadler, T. Müller, H. Moritz, and T. Esslinger, Nature Physics **8**, 454 (2012).
[8] H. Häffner, W. Hänsel, C. Roos, J. Benhelm, M. Chwalla, T. Körber, U. Rapol, M. Riebe, P. Schmidt, C. Becher, *et al.*, Nature **438**, 643 (2005).
[9] T. Monz, P. Schindler, J. T. Barreiro, M. Chwalla, D. Nigg, W. A. Coish, M. Harlander, W. Hänsel, M. Hennrich, and R. Blatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 130506 (2011).
[10] J. G. Bohnet, B. C. Sawyer, J. W. Britton, M. L. Wall, A. M. Rey, M. Foss-Feig, and J. J. Bollinger, Science **352**, 1297 (2016).
[11] R. Prevedel, G. Cronenberg, M. S. Tame, M. Paternostro, P. Walther, M. S. Kim, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 020503 (2009).
[12] T. S. Iskhakov, I. N. Agafonov, M. V. Chekhova, and G. Leuchs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 150502 (2012).
[13] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 5138 (1993).
[14] A. Sørensen and K. Mølmer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2274 (1999).
[15] G. Tóth, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052327 (2004).
[16] G. Vitagliano, P. Hyllus, I. n. L. Egusquiza, and G. Tóth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 240502 (2011).
[17] G. Vitagliano, I. Apellaniz, I. n. L. Egusquiza, and G. Tóth, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 032307 (2014).
[18] A. J. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 307 (2001).
[19] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 555 (2007).
[20] M. R. Dowling, S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052113 (2006).
[21] P. Hyllus, L. Pezzé, and A. Smerzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 120501 (2010).
[22] P. Hyllus, L. Pezzé, A. Smerzi, and G. Tóth, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 012337 (2012).
[23] I. Saideh, A. D. Ribeiro, G. Ferrini, T. Coudreau, P. Milman, and A. Keller, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052334 (2015).
[24] J. Ma, X. Wang, C. Sun, and F. Nori, Physics Reports **509**, 89 (2011).
[25] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
[26] R. A. Bertlmann and P. Krammer, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **41**, 235303 (2008).

Appendix A: Proof of Eq. (6)

In this appendix, we present in detail the different steps to derive our main inequality (6). As mentioned in the main text, we proceed to the proof in two steps. Firstly, we start by proving the inequality (6) for product states. Next, we generalize the inequality for mixed state by convexity argument. Before proceeding to the two parts of the proof, let us rewrite the inequality (6) and its different ingredients:

$$\left(\langle\hat{N}\rangle-1\right)\sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}}\tilde{\Delta}^2A_k-\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}}\langle\tilde{A}_k^2\rangle\geq-\langle\hat{N}\rangle\left(\langle\hat{N}\rangle-1\right)\alpha^2-\delta, \tag{A1}$$

with $\alpha^2=\sup_{\rho^{(i)}}\left[\sum_{k=1}^3\langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle^2_{\rho^{(i)}}\right]$ and $\hat{N}=\sum_{i=1}^N N^{(i)}$ represents the particle number operator as explained in the main text. We choose the operator $N^{(i)}$ to be positive and to verify the following inequality:

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^3\langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle^2_{\rho^{(i)}}}{\alpha^2}\leq\langle N^{(i)}\rangle^2_{\rho^{(i)}}\leq 1 \tag{A2}$$

for any state $\rho^{(i)}$ acting on the single particle Hilbert space. One can always find a positive operator $N^{(i)}$ such that Eq. (A2) is verified, since one can always choose $N^{(i)}$ to be the identity in the single particle Hilbert space. Finally, we recall the expression for δ (16):

$$\delta=\alpha^2\langle\hat{N}\rangle+\tilde{\Delta}^2A_1+\tilde{\Delta}^2A_2+\tilde{\Delta}^2A_3 \tag{A3}$$

1. Proof of Eq. (6) for product states

As we have outlined in the main text, our main improvement comes from deriving a new bound for $\langle A_i\rangle^2$ better than the standard one

$$\langle A_i\rangle^2\leq N\sum_{k=1}^N\langle A_i^{(k)}\rangle^2. \tag{A4}$$

The previous inequality can be obtained directly from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. However, it can also be obtained in a different way using the Heisenberg uncertainty inequality as follows. First, for the sake of illustration, consider that $A_i=S_x=\sum_{i=1}^N\sigma_x^{(i)}$ and let $|\psi\rangle$, the product state $|\psi\rangle=\bigotimes_{i=1}^N|\psi^{(i)}\rangle$ of N spin-1/2. Starting from the Heisenberg uncertainty inequality:

$$\langle S_x\rangle^2\leq\left(\Delta S_y\right)^2\left(\Delta S_z\right)^2, \tag{A5}$$

we can apply a rotation $U^{(i)}=e^{i\frac{\sigma_x^{(i)}\theta_i}{2}}$ to each spin such that

$$\langle\sigma_y^{(i)}\rangle_{U^{(i)}|\psi^{(i)}\rangle}=0,\langle\sigma_x^{(i)}\rangle_{U^{(i)}|\psi^{(i)}\rangle}=\langle\sigma_x^{(i)}\rangle_{|\psi^{(i)}\rangle}.$$

Since $|\psi\rangle$ is a pure product state, we have:

$$\langle\sigma_z^{(i)}\rangle^2_{U^{(i)}|\psi^{(i)}\rangle} = 1 - \langle\sigma_x^{(i)}\rangle^2_{|\psi^{(i)}\rangle}.$$

Then, a straightforward calculation, in the rotated state, would yield $(\Delta S_y)^2 = N$ and $(\Delta S_z)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle\sigma_x^{(i)}\rangle^2_{|\psi^{(i)}\rangle}$, hence:

$$\langle S_x\rangle^2_{|\psi\rangle} \leq N\sum_{i=1}^N \langle\sigma_x^{(i)}\rangle^2_{|\psi^{(i)}\rangle} \tag{A6}$$

which is the same inequality than Eq. (A4).

It is the above reasoning that motivates the mapping of the original product state $\rho = \bigotimes \rho^{(i)}$ to the the product state of N spin 1, $R = \bigotimes_{i=1}^N R^{(i)}$, where:

$$R^{(i)} = n_i|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle\langle\Psi^{(i)}| + (1-n_i)|2^{(i)}\rangle\langle 2^{(i)}|, \tag{A7}$$

$n_i = \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}$, and $|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle$ is a pure state defined, in the subspace spanned by $|0^{(i)}\rangle, |1^{(i)}\rangle$, as:

$$|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle\langle\Psi^{(i)}| = \frac{\sigma_0{}^{(i)}}{2} + \frac{\langle A_1^{(i)}\rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i}\sigma_x{}^{(i)} + \frac{\langle A_2^{(i)}\rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i}\sigma_y{}^{(i)} + \frac{\langle A_3^{(i)}\rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i}\sigma_z \tag{A8}$$

where $\sigma_0 = |0^{(i)}\rangle\langle 0^{(i)}| + |1^{(i)}\rangle\langle 1^{(i)}|$ and $\sigma_k^{(i)} (k = x, y, z)$ are the Pauli matrices in the same subspace. The constant η_i is chosen as $\eta_i = \sqrt{\langle A_1^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_2^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_3^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2}$, to ensure the purity of the state $|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle$.

a. *Inequality for* $\langle A_i\rangle^2$

Following the same reasoning as above, We first apply the following unitary $|2^{(i)}\rangle\langle 2^{(i)}| + e^{-i\theta_i\sigma_x^{(i)}/2}$ to the state $R^{(i)}$ Eq. (A7). After applying the unitary, we get the following state:

$$r^{(i)} = n_i|\Phi^{(i)}\rangle\langle\Phi^{(i)}| + (1-n_i)\,|2^{(i)}\rangle\langle 2^{(i)}|, \tag{A9}$$

where $|\Phi^{(i)}\rangle = e^{-i\theta_i\sigma_x^{(i)}/2}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle$. We choose θ_i such that:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Phi^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Phi^{(i)}\rangle &\equiv \cos\theta_i\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle \\ &\quad - \sin\theta_i\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_z^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle = 0\end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

which can be achieved with the choice

$$\cos\theta_i = \frac{\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_z^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_z^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle^2 + \langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle^2}},$$

$$\sin\theta_i = \frac{\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_z^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle^2 + \langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle^2}}$$

Since $\left[\sigma_x^{(i)}, e^{-i\theta_i\sigma_x^{(i)}/2}\right] = 0$, we have:

$$\langle\Phi^{(i)}|\sigma_x^{(i)}|\Phi^{(i)}\rangle = \langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_x^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle. \tag{A11}$$

Now, because $\frac{\eta_i}{\alpha n_i} \leq 1$ (A2), there exists an angle ξ_i such that:

$$\langle\Phi^{(i)}|e^{i\xi_i\sigma_y^{(i)}/2}\sigma_x^{(i)}e^{-i\xi_i\sigma_y^{(i)}/2}|\Phi^{(i)}\rangle = \frac{\eta_i}{\alpha n_i}\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_x^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle. \tag{A12}$$

Applying the unitary $|2^{(i)}\rangle\langle 2^{(i)}| + e^{-i\xi_i\sigma_y^{(i)}/2}$ to the state $r^{(i)}$, it becomes:

$$R'^{(i)} = n_i|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle\langle\Psi'^{(i)}| + (1-n_i)\,|2^{(i)}\rangle\langle 2^{(i)}|, \tag{A13}$$

where $|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle = e^{-i\xi_i\sigma_y^{(i)}/2}|\Phi^{(i)}\rangle$. Since $\left[\sigma_y^{(i)}, e^{-i\xi_i\sigma_y^{(i)}/2}\right] = 0$, we have:

$$\langle\Psi'^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle = \langle\Phi^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Phi^{(i)}\rangle = 0. \tag{A14}$$

And because the state $|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle$ is pure we have:

$$\langle\Psi'^{(i)}|\sigma_x^{(i)}|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle^2 + \langle\Psi'^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle^2 + \langle\Psi'^{(i)}|\sigma_z^{(i)}|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle^2 = 1$$

i.e.,

$$\langle\Psi'^{(i)}|\sigma_z^{(i)}|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle^2 = 1 - \frac{\eta_i^2}{\alpha^2 n_i^2}\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_x^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle^2 \tag{A15}$$

Finally we are in position to apply the Heisenberg uncertainty principle for the operators S_x, S_y, S_z in the state $R' = \bigotimes R'^{(i)}$:

$$|\langle S_x\rangle_{R'}|^2 \leq (\Delta S_y)^2\,(\Delta S_z)^2\,. \tag{A16}$$

For product states $R' = \bigotimes_{i=1}^N R'^{(i)}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta S_y)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\Delta\sigma_y^{(i)}\right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle\left(\sigma_y^{(i)}\right)^2\rangle_{R'^{(i)}} - \langle\sigma_y^{(i)}\rangle^2_{R'^{(i)}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N n_i - \sum_{i=1}^N n_i^2\langle\Psi'^{(i)}|\sigma_y^{(i)}|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N n_i.\end{aligned} \tag{A17}$$

The same calculation for S_z will give:

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta S_z)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^N n_i - \sum_{i=1}^N n_i^2\langle\Psi'^{(i)}|\sigma_z^{(i)}|\Psi'^{(i)}\rangle^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N n_i - n_i^2 + \frac{\eta_i^2}{\alpha^2}\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_x^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle^2.\end{aligned} \tag{A18}$$

We also have:

$$\langle S_x\rangle_{R'} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\eta_i}{\alpha}\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_x^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle, \tag{A19}$$

but from Eq. (A7), we have:

$$\langle\Psi^{(i)}|\sigma_x^{(i)}|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle = \frac{\langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho}{\eta_i}. \tag{A20}$$

Using all the above the inequality (A16), can be simplified to obtain the desired form:

$$\langle A_x\rangle_\rho^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^N n_i \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right) + \alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^N n_i \left(\sum_{i=1}^N n_i - \sum_{i=1}^N n_i^2\right), \tag{A21}$$

which is exactly the inequality Eq. (12), since $\langle \hat{N}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$.

b. *Inequality for* $\langle A_i\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_j\rangle_\rho^2$

One might suggest adding the two inequalities (12) for the quantities $\langle A_i\rangle_\rho^2$ and $\langle A_j\rangle_\rho^2$. But we can derive a tigther inequality by considering the following mapping of the form (A7):

$$R^{(i)} = n_i \left(\frac{{\sigma_0}^{(i)}}{2} + \frac{\langle A_x'^{(i)}\rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i}{\sigma_x}^{(i)} + \frac{\langle A_y'^{(i)}\rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i}{\sigma_y}^{(i)} + \frac{\langle A_z'^{(i)}\rangle_\rho}{2\eta_i}{\sigma_z}^{(i)}\right) + (1-n_i)\,|2^{(i)}\rangle\langle 2^{(i)}| \tag{A22}$$

where we have chosen: $\langle A_x'^{(i)}\rangle_\rho = \sqrt{\langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_y^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2}$, $\langle A_y'^{(i)}\rangle_\rho = 0$ and $\langle A_z'^{(i)}\rangle_\rho = \langle A_z^{(i)}\rangle_\rho$. Then we apply the inequality (12) for $\langle A_x'^{(i)}\rangle_\rho$ and we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle A_x'\rangle_\rho^2 = & \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{\langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_y^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2}\right)^2 \\ \leq & \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_y^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right) \\ & + \alpha^2 \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\langle N\rangle_\rho - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{A23}$$

Using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$x_i x_j + y_i y_j \leq \sqrt{x_i^2 + y_i^2}\sqrt{x_j^2 + y_j^2}$$

we obtain:

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho\right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_y^{(i)}\rangle_\rho\right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{\langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_y^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2}\right)^2 \tag{A24}$$

and we finally get:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle A_i\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_j\rangle_\rho^2 \leq & \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_i^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_j^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right) \\ & + \alpha^2 \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\langle N\rangle_\rho - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right)\end{aligned} \tag{A25}$$

Following the same steps, we can prove in general that:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle A_k\rangle_\rho^2 \leq & \langle N\rangle_\rho \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 \\ & + \alpha^2 \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\langle N\rangle_\rho - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right)\end{aligned} \tag{A26}$$

Where $\mathcal{I}$ is any subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, M\}$, and

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^M \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2}{\alpha^2} \leq \langle n^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2 \leq 1 \tag{A27}$$

$$\alpha^2 = \sup_{\rho^{(i)}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^M \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle_{\rho^{(i)}}^2\right]. \tag{A28}$$

Notice that in the case of angular momentum operators $M = 3$, as in the main text. With inequality Eq.(A26), we have all the ingredients needed to derive inequality Eq.(6).

c. *Proof of Eq.* (6) *for product states*

Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \cdots, M\}$ including the empty set ϕ. We have the following equalities for product states:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \tilde{A}_k^2\rangle \equiv \langle A_k^2\rangle - \sum_i \langle {A_k^{(i)}}^2\rangle &= \sum_{i\neq j} \langle A_k^{(i)} A_k^{(j)}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i\neq j} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle\langle A_k^{(j)}\rangle = \langle A_k\rangle^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle^2\end{aligned} \tag{A29}$$

$$\tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k \equiv \langle \tilde{A}_k^2\rangle - \langle A_k\rangle^2 = -\sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle^2. \tag{A30}$$

From Eq. (A29) and Eq. (A26), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \tilde{A}_k^2\rangle_\rho \leq & (\langle N\rangle_\rho - 1)\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle A_k^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right) \\ & + \alpha^2 \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\langle N\rangle_\rho - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{A31}$$

Now we have all the ingredients to derive the desired inequality. From (A31) and (A30) we get:

$$(\langle \hat{N}\rangle_\rho - 1)\sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle \tilde{A}_k^2\rangle \geq -\alpha^2 \langle N\rangle_\rho \left(\langle N\rangle_\rho - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right) - \left(\langle \hat{N}\rangle_\rho - 1\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_y^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_z^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2\right). \tag{A32}$$

The above inequality is hard to extend for mixed states, that's why we put it in a more convenient form and we

simplify it further using $\langle A_x^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_y^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_z^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2 \leq \alpha^2\langle N^{(i)}\rangle_\rho^2$ to finally get:

$$\langle\hat{N}\rangle_\rho \sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k + \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \langle\tilde{A}_k^2\rangle \geq -\alpha^2\langle N\rangle_\rho^2. \tag{A33}$$

d. Proof of Eq. (6) for mixed separable states

Let us consider the most general separable state as a convex mixture of pure product states:

$$\rho = \sum_l \lambda_l \rho_l \quad : \lambda_l \geq 0,\, \sum_l \lambda_l = 1,\, \rho_l^2 = \rho_l \tag{A34}$$

Then we have the following inequality :

$$\sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k + \alpha^2\langle N\rangle_\rho \underset{\text{concavity of variance}}{\geq} \sum_l \lambda_l \left(\sum_{k\notin\mathcal{I}} \tilde{\Delta}_l^2 A_k + \alpha^2\langle N\rangle_{\rho_l}\right)$$
$$\underset{Eq.\ (A33)}{\geq} \sum_l \lambda_l \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \frac{\langle A_k\rangle_{\rho_l}^2}{\langle N\rangle_{\rho_l}}, \tag{A35}$$

where we have used the definition of the modified moments $\tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k = \langle\tilde{A}_k^2\rangle - \langle A_k\rangle^2$ for the right hand side. Next, we use the convexity of the function $f(x,y) = \dfrac{x^2}{y}$ over $\mathbb{R}\times(0,\infty]$. The convexity of $f(x,y)$ can be shown by considering its Hessian matrix $H_{i,j} = \dfrac{\partial^2 f(x_1,x_2)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{y} & -\frac{2x}{y^2} \\ -\frac{2x}{y^2} & \frac{2x^2}{y^3} \end{pmatrix} \tag{A36}$$

which eigenvalues are $\{0, \dfrac{2(x^2+y^2)}{y^3}\}$. Both eigenvalues being positive for any $(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}\times(0,\infty]$, we can conclude $f(x,y) = \dfrac{x^2}{y}$ is convex. From the convexity of $f(x,y)$, we obtain a lower bound of Eq. (A35):

$$\sum_l \lambda_l \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \frac{\langle A_k\rangle_{\rho_l}^2}{\langle N\rangle_{\rho_l}} \geq \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}} \frac{\langle A_k\rangle_\rho^2}{\langle N\rangle_\rho} = \frac{\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}}\langle\tilde{A}_k^2\rangle_\rho - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}}\tilde{\Delta}^2 A_k}{\langle N\rangle_\rho} \tag{A37}$$

completing the proof of inequality Eq. (6) for any separable state.

Appendix B: Mapping to a qutrit Eq (9)

Here we will consider only a special case of mappings to a qutrit, where the image is a mixed state of a spin-1/2 like state, in the subspace $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$, and the state $|2\rangle$ as in Eq (9). The starting point is the mapping that maps every spin-j state to the following spin-1/2 state:

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2} + \frac{\langle A_x\rangle_\rho}{2\eta}\sigma_x + \frac{\langle A_y\rangle_\rho}{2\eta}\sigma_y + \frac{\langle A_z\rangle_\rho}{2\eta}\sigma_z, \tag{B1}$$

where $\eta = \sqrt{\langle A_x\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_y\rangle_\rho^2 + \langle A_z\rangle_\rho^2}$. The above mapping is a completely positive mapping that can be written as [23]

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_D}\left[U\rho\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger\right], \tag{B2}$$

where $|0\rangle$ is a reference state in the qubit subspace and U is an isometry that can always be written as:

$$U : \mathcal{H}_{2s+1}\otimes\mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_D\otimes\mathcal{H}_2 : U = \sum_{i=0}^{4} \mathcal{A}_i\otimes\sigma_i\,;\, \sigma_0 = \mathbb{1}, \tag{B3}$$

where the dimension of $\mathcal{H}_D$ satisfies $D \geq 2s+1$. Since the three Gell-Mann matrices $\Lambda_{1,2}^s$, $\Lambda_{1,2}^a$ and Λ_1 [26] are the Pauli operators in the subspace $\{|0\rangle,|1\rangle\}$ of the qutrit, we can define the following mapping:

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_D}\left[\mathcal{U}\rho\otimes(\beta|0\rangle\langle 0| + (1-\beta)|2\rangle\langle 2|)\,\mathcal{U}^\dagger\right], \tag{B4}$$

where

$$\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{H}_{2s+1}\otimes\mathcal{H}_3 \to \mathcal{H}_D\otimes\mathcal{H}_3 : \mathcal{U} = \sum_{i=0}^{4} \mathcal{A}_i\otimes\sigma_i + \mathcal{I}\otimes|2\rangle\langle 2|, \tag{B5}$$

$$\sigma_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|\,,\ \sigma_1 = \Lambda_{1,2}^s\,,\ \sigma_2 = \Lambda_{1,2}^a\,,\ \sigma_3 = \Lambda_1$$

$$\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{H}_{2s+1} \to \mathcal{H}_D\,:\, \mathcal{I}^\dagger\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{1}_{2s+1} \tag{B6}$$

an arbitrary isometry from $\mathcal{H}_{2s+1}$ to $\mathcal{H}_D$, and $0<\beta<1$ is some positive number which, in the mapping of interest (9), was set to be $\beta_i = n_i = \langle N^{(i)}\rangle_\rho$. One can easily verify that $\mathcal{U}$ is an isometry, i.e., $\mathcal{U}^\dagger\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{1}_{2s+1}\otimes\mathbb{1}_3$ and that the resulting mapping can be written as:

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \beta\left(\frac{\sigma_0}{2} + \frac{\langle A_x\rangle_\rho}{2\eta}\sigma_x + \frac{\langle A_y\rangle_\rho}{2\eta}\sigma_y + \frac{\langle A_z\rangle_\rho}{2\eta}\sigma_z\right) + (1-\beta)|2\rangle\langle 2|. \tag{B7}$$

Hence we have proven that the mapping (9) is completely positive.